

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

NOTIFICATION OF ELECTION

(PCT Rule 61.2)

From the INTERNATIONAL BUREAU

To:

Commissioner
US Department of Commerce
United States Patent and Trademark
Office, PCT
2011 South Clark Place Room
CP2/5C24
Arlington, VA 22202
ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE
in its capacity as elected Office

Date of mailing (day/month/year) 14 February 2001 (14.02.01)	
International application No. PCT/US00/14997	Applicant's or agent's file reference 68007-012
International filing date (day/month/year) 01 June 2000 (01.06.00)	Priority date (day/month/year) 01 June 1999 (01.06.99)
Applicant JACQUEZ, Geoffrey, M.	

1. The designated Office is hereby notified of its election made:



in the demand filed with the International Preliminary Examining Authority on:

06 December 2000 (06.12.00)



in a notice effecting later election filed with the International Bureau on:

2. The election ☒ was



was not

made before the expiration of 19 months from the priority date or, where Rule 32 applies, within the time limit under Rule 32.2(b).

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Authorized officer <p style="text-align: center;">R. Forax</p>
Facsimile No.: (41-22) 740.14.35	Telephone No.: (41-22) 338.83.38

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

REC'D 20 JUL 2001

WIPO PCT

Applicant's or agent's file reference 68007-012	FOR FURTHER ACTION See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)	
International application No. PCT/US00/14997	International filing date (day/month/year) 01 JUNE 2000	Priority date (day/month/year) 01 JUNE 1999
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC Please See Supplemental Sheet.		
Applicant JACQUEZ, GEOFFREY M.		

1. This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.
2. This REPORT consists of a total of 5 sheets.
- ☐ This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e., sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority. (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).
- These annexes consist of a total of 0 sheets.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

- I ☒ Basis of the report
- II ☐ Priority
- III ☐ Non-establishment of report with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability
- IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
- V ☒ Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- VI ☐ Certain documents cited
- VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
- VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

Date of submission of the demand 06 DECEMBER 2000	Date of completion of this report 07 JUNE 2001
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Box PCT Washington, D.C. 20231	Authorized officer ANH LY <i>Peggy Harrod</i>
Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Telephone No. (703) 306-4527

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/US00/14997

I. Basis of the report

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application: *☒ the international application as originally filed☒ the description:

pages 1-8, as originally filed
pages NONE, filed with the demand
pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____

☒ the claims:

pages 9-11, as originally filed
pages NONE, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
pages NONE, filed with the demand
pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____

☒ the drawings:

pages 1-4, as originally filed
pages NONE, filed with the demand
pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____

☒ the sequence listing part of the description:

pages NONE, as originally filed
pages NONE, filed with the demand
pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____

2. With regard to the **language**, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in printed form.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☒ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

☒ the description, pages NONE
☒ the claims, Nos. NONE
☒ the drawings, sheets/fig NONE

5. ☐ This report has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).**

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17).

**Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/US00/14997

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**1. statement**

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>1-16</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>NONE</u>	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims	<u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>1-16</u>	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1-16</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>NONE</u>	NO

2. citations and explanations (Rule 70.7)

Claim 1 lacks an inventive step under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated over US 5,634,051, Thomson.

As per claim 1 Thomson teaches identifying the user (col. 9, lines 41-67, obtaining an identification code of the identified user (col. 2, lines 20-34, col. 10, lines 1-16), searching the user databases to link the identification code (see abstract, col. 2, lines 20-34), accessing specific user data related to the identified user from the linked database (col. 9, lines 13-14), receiving a user's natural language input (col. 6, lines 35-460, interpreting the natural language input (col. 7, lines 27-44), formulating a response by integrating the natural language input from the user with specific user data from the linked user database and data from the knowledge database (col. 1, lines 14-53, and col. 9, lines 13-40), submitting the response to the user (and updating the linked user database with the natural language input and response whereby future responses may refer to the updated linked user database for the identified user (col. 7, lines 19-26, col. 8, lines 16-21).

Claims 2-5, 10, and 15 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over US 5643,051 Thomson in view of US 5,379,366 Noyes.

As per claim 2 Thomson does not teaches "the step of submitting a natural language response to interact ...". Noyes teaches "a natural language response to interact ..." (col. 9, lines 7-36, and col. 41, lines 35-67). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Noyes with the teachings of Thomson, because using the "step of submitting a natural language response to interact . . .", would have given those skilled in the art the tools to search for data in a more detailed fashion.

As per claim 3 Thomson does not teaches "the step of utilizing a natural language simulator to parse the natural language ...". Noyes teaches "utilizing a natural language simulator to parse the natural language ..." (see abstract, col. 41, lines 45-67). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Noyes with the teachings of Thomson, because using the "step of utilizing a (Continued on Supplemental Sheet.)

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

Continuation of: Boxes I - VIII

Sheet 10

CLASSIFICATION:

The International Patent Classification (IPC) and/or the National classification are as listed below:

IPC(7): G06F 9/44, 13/00, 17/30; H04L 12/66; H04M 15/00; and US Cl.: 395/54, 379/111, 370/401, 395/605, 707/501

V. 2. REASONED STATEMENTS - CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS (Continued):

natural language simulator to parse the natural language ...", would have given those skilled in the art the tools to search for data in a more detailed fashion.

As per claim 4 Thomson does not teaches "the step of recording and storing the natural language ...". Noyes teaches "recording and storing the natural language ..." (col. 46, lines 60-67, and col. 47, lines 1-36). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Noyes with the teachings of Thomson, because using the "step of recording and storing the natural language ...", would have given those skilled in the art the tools to search for data in a more detailed fashion.

As per claim 5 Thomson does not teaches "the formatting of the response is further defined as uniquely molding ...". Noyes teaches "the formatting of the response is further defined as uniquely molding ..." (col. 4, lines 20-45, and col. 11, lines 3-67). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Noyes with the teachings of Thomson, because using the "formatting of the response is further defined as uniquely molding ...", would have given those skilled in the art the tools to search for data in a more detailed fashion.

As per claim 10 Thomson does not teaches "the step of accessing the specific user data for the identified user is further defined as accessing previous inputs and responses for the identified user". Noyes teaches "the accessing of the specific user data for identified user..." (col. 55, lines 25-67, and col. 56, lines 1-2). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Noyes with the teachings of Thomson, because using the "step of accessing of the specific user data for the identified user...", would have given those skilled in the art the tools to search for data in a more detailed fashion.

As per claim 15 Thomson does not teaches "the step of determining the need for human intervention and accessing human intervention in a natural language ...". Noyes teaches "the determining the need for human intervention and accessing human intervention in a natural language format " col. 2, lines 46-58, and col. 10, lines 36-67). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Noyes with the teachings of Thomson, because using the "step of accessing of the specific user data for the identified user...", would have given those skilled in the art the tools to search for data in a more detailed fashion.

Claims 6-9 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over US 5643,051 Thomson in view of US 6,032,162 Burk.

As per claim 6 Thomson does not teaches "the particular computer application". Burk teaches "the computer application" (col 1, lines 38-54, col. 2, lines 23-67, and col. 3, lines 8-55). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Thomson with the teachings of Burk, because using the "particular computer application", would have given those skilled in the art the tools to search for data in a more detailed fashion.

As per claim 7 Thomson does not teaches "the responses to the user in order to direct the user toward the desired result". Burk teaches "the responses to the user to direct the desired result" (col 1, lines 38-54, col. 2, lines 23-67, and col. 4, lines 22-54). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Thomson with the teachings of Burk, because using the "responses to the user to direct to the desired result", would have given those skilled in the art the tools to search for data in a more detailed fashion.

As per claim 8 Thomson does not teaches "the computer related application chosen by the identified user in order to further mold the responses to the user". Burk teaches "the computer related application ..." (col 1, lines 38-54, col. 3, lines 8-55, and col. 5, lines 62-67). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Thomson with the teachings of Burk, because using the "computer related application chosen by the identified user", would have given those skilled in the art the tools to search for data in a more detailed fashion.

As per claim 9 Thomson does not teaches "the computer related application and incorporating this information into the response to the user". Burk teaches "the computer related application and incorporating this information into the response to the user" (col. 1, lines 38-54, col. 3, lines 8-55, and col.5, lines 62-67). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Thomson with the teachings of Burk, because using the "computer related application and incorporating this information into the response to the user", would have given those skilled in the art the tools to search for data in a more detailed fashion.

Claims 11-14 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over US 5643,051 Thomson in view of US 5,838,682 Dekelbaum.

As per claim 11 Thomson does not teaches "the accessing commercial transaction history for the identified user".

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

Continuation of: Boxes I - VIII

Sheet 11

Dekelbaum teaches "the accessing the commercial transaction history for the identified user" (see abstract, col 3, lines 29-67, col. 14, lines 12-48). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Thomson with the teachings of Dekelbaum, because using the "accessing the commercial transaction history ...", would have given those skilled in the art the tools to search for data in a more detailed fashion.

As per claim 12 Thomson does not teaches "the product database". Dekelbaum teaches "the product database" (col 1, lines 44-58, and col. 11, lines 30-67). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Thomson with the teachings of Dekelbaum, because using the "product database", would have given those skilled in the art the tools to search for data in a more detailed fashion.

As per claim 13 Thomson does not teaches "the help program and maintaining the knowledge database". Dekelbaum teaches "the help program and maintaining the knowledge database" (col 4, lines 8-47, col. 6, lines 16-38, and col. 13, lines 50-67). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Thomson with the teachings of Dekelbaum, because using the "help program and maintaining the knowledge database", would have given those skilled in the art the tools to search for data in a more detailed fashion.

As per claim 14 Thomson does not teaches "interacting and initiating the trainer to populate, update and monitor the knowledge database". Dekelbaum teaches "interacting and initiating the trainer to populate, update and monitor the knowledge database" (col. 12, lines 1-67). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Thomson with the teachings of Dekelbaum, because using the "interacting and initiating ...", would have given those skilled in the art the tools to search for data in a more detailed fashion.

Claim 16 lacks an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over US 5643,051 Thomson in view of US 5,978,455 Johnson. As per claim 16 Thomson does not teaches "a pricing plan for the help program...". Johnson teaches "the pricing plan for the help program ..." (col. 1, lines 29-56, and col. 3, lines 39-65). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Thomson with the teachings of Johnson, because using the "pricing plan for the help program...", would have given those skilled in the art the tools to search for data in a more detailed fashion.

Claims 1-16 meets the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), because this method is useful to a user in conversing in a natural language conversation uniquely fashioned to the user in an interactive help software program.

----- NEW CITATIONS -----

NONE

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International application No.
PCT/US00/14997

A. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER

IPC(7) : G06F 9/44, 13/00, 17/30; H04/L 12/66; H04M 15/00;

US CL : 395/54, 379/111, 370/401, 395/605, 707/501

According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC

B. FIELDS SEARCHED

Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols)

U.S. : 395/54, 379/111, 370/401, 395/605, 707/501

Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched

Electronic data base consulted during the international search (name of data base and, where practicable, search terms used)

C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category*	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
X --- Y	U.S. 5,634,051 A (THOMSON) 27 MAY 1997, column 3, lines 51-54, 66-67, column 8, lines 18-21, column 10, lines 3-4, 50-53 and column 11, lines 1-5.	1 ----- 2-16
Y	U.S. 5,379,366 A (NOYES) 03 January 1995, column 2, lines 46-58, col5 lines 23-26, 61-62 column 7, lines 53-55, column 9, lines 43-45, column 43, lines 34-46.	2-5, 10, 15
Y,P	U.S. 6,032,162 A (BURK) 29 February 2000, column 1, lines 51-54, column 3, lines 8-15, 36-40, column 4, lines 40-54.	6-9



Further documents are listed in the continuation of Box C.



See patent family annex.

* Special categories of cited documents:	"T" later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention
"A" document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance	"X" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone
"E" earlier document published on or after the international filing date	"Y" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art
"L" document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)	"&" document member of the same patent family
"O" document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means	
"P" document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed	

Date of the actual completion of the international search

11 JULY 2000

Date of mailing of the international search report

02 AUG 2000

Name and mailing address of the ISA/US
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Box PCT
Washington, D.C. 20231

Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230

Authorized officer

ANH LY

Telephone No. (703) 305-3200

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International application No.
PCT/US00/14997

C (Continuation). DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category*	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
Y	U.S. 5,838,682 A (DEKELMAUM et al.) 17 November 1998, column 1, lines 50-59, column 6, lines 9-14, column 11, lines 56-67, column 14, lines 22-25, column 15, lines 45-50, column 16, lines 8-10.	11-14
Y,P	U.S. 5,978,455 A (JOHNSON et al.) 02 Noveember 1999, Column 1, lines 29-38, Column 3, Lines 39-57.	16
A	U.S. 5,377,103 A (LAMBETTI et al.) 27 December 1994, ALL	1-16